

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 2 November 2005. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1, 4, 8, 16 and 19 have been amended to clarify the language thereof and/or the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application. Additionally, Claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 14, 15 and 18 have been canceled by this Amendment.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that the phrase "input from the outside" was not clear as to what was being referred to. Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to replace the rejected phrase with - - input from a source external to the processor - - which clarifies what is being referred to. Therefore, it is now believed that the Claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 18 and 19 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 16 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 18 therein, thereby effectively rewriting Claim 18 in independent form, including all

of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 16, and any intervening claims, which there were none. Thus, Claim 16 and the Claims dependent thereon should now be allowable. Claim 19 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of original Claim 16 therein. Thus, Claim 19 has been placed in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 16, and any intervening claims, which there were none. Thus, Claim 19 should now be allowable.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4 and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Bril, et al., U.S. Patent 6,118,413.

Before discussing the prior art relied upon by the Examiner, it is believed beneficial to first briefly review the structure of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now defined in Claim 1. The invention of the subject Patent Application is directed to a data processing system using dual monitors. The system includes a memory for providing a data processing area using a program and at least one or more input means for inputting data. The system includes a first video graphics adapter for generating and outputting screen data for displaying a result processed by at least one or more programs. The system includes a second video graphics adapter for generating and outputting screen data for displaying a result processed by at least one or more programs. The result is different from the result processed and displayed by the first VGA. The system includes a processor coupled to each of the input means, the memory, the first VGA and the second VGA for processing data input through the input means

using the memory and outputting a processed result through the first and second VGAs. The data processing system includes a first monitor coupled to the first VGA for displaying screen data output from the first graphics adapter, and a second monitor coupled to the second VGA for displaying screen data from the second graphics adapter. Still further, the data processing system includes a sound processing part coupled to the processor. The sound processing part is coupled to a speaker for outputting sound responsive to signals provided from the processor. A broadcast receiving part is included in the data processing system for receiving television/radio broadcasting waves. The broadcast receiving part has a pair of outputs respectively coupled to the first VGA and the second VGA for output of video data thereto. The broadcast receiving part is coupled to the processor for control of the broadcast receiving part and transfer of audio signals to the sound processing part. The processor controls which one of the first and second monitors a television broadcast is displayed on. The processor displays the processed result of a main program presently used by a user through the first VGA and the first monitor. Process information which is different from the contents displayed on the first monitor and input from a source external to the processor, and displays the information through the second VGA and the second monitor, and in case of selecting one of user interfaces displayed through the first or second monitors, displays the processed result on the other monitor.

In contradistinction, the Bril, et al. reference is directed to dual displays having independent resolutions and refresh rates. The system has the capability of displaying data on a CRT and/or a television, as well as an LCD and/or passive device. However, nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest a broadcast receiving part for receiving television/radio broadcasting waves, the broadcast receiving part having a pair of outputs respectively coupled to the first VGA and second VGA for output of video data thereto, the broadcast receiving part being coupled to the processor for control of the broadcast receiving part and transfer of audio signals to the sound processing part, the processor controlling which one of the first and second monitors a television broadcast is displayed on, as now claimed.


Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the television 292 is utilized as a video monitor, receiving display signals derived from the display memory 220 and coupled through the CRT FIFO 221, the CRT video data path 222, RAM 223 and the TV encoder 291, column 7, line 45 through column 8, line 24. Nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest video broadcast signals being input through the CRT controller (first VGA) 224 and the LCD controller (second VGA) 234 and the processor, as now claimed.

Therefore, as the reference fails to disclose each and every one of the elements of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed, it cannot anticipate that invention. Further, as the reference fails to suggest such a

combination of elements, and in fact teaches away from that combination, in that it utilizes the TV receiver simply as a video monitor, it cannot make obvious that invention either. The remaining references relied upon by the Examiner, have been carefully reviewed and analyzed, but are not believed, either individually or in combination to overcome the deficiencies of Bril, et al. Therefore, it is now believed that Claim 1 is allowable, as are the Claims dependent thereon. In particular, with respect to Claim 11, such calls for both the first and second monitors to be coupled to their respective video graphics adapters by a single cable which transmits the two video signals between the respective VGAs and the monitors. Nowhere does Bril, et al. disclose or suggest such an arrangement. Thus, it is believed that Claim 11 is itself patentably distinct.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

  
David I. Klein  
Registration #33,253

Dated: *27 April 2006*

Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678  
Customer No. 04586